

Applicant has neither amended, canceled nor added any claims. Accordingly, Claims 1-20 are currently pending in the application.

I. Objection of Amendment under 35 U.S.C. §132

The Examiner has objected to the Amendment filed 1/21/2003 under 35 U.S.C. §132 because it allegedly introduces new matter into the disclosure of the invention. In contrast to the Examiner's suggestion, the amendment to the specification and claims does not add new matter for a couple of reasons. First, the amendment does not add new matter to the specification because it just substitutes one convention for describing a feature for another convention for describing the same feature. As set forth in the previous response to the Examiner's Action, the Applicant was just substituting one convention for describing a channel dopant for another convention. In hindsight (i.e., after receiving the Examiner's objection) the Applicant agrees that the original convention was not the most common convention, however, it is still a proper convention. The amendment to the specification and claims was solely directed to clarifying the convention issue such that the Examiner could more clearly prosecute the invention.

Second, the amendment does not add new matter to the specification or claims because FIGURES 1 and 7, and their respective description, provide sufficient information such that one skilled in the art would understand that the region labeled 160 is actually a channel dopant. FIGURES 1 and 7, and their respective description, disclose that the region 160 is dopant opposite to the source/drain regions 180. As the Examiner so correctly pointed out, the region 160 could not be part of the source/drain regions because it has an opposite type dopant. This fact, in conjunction

with the location of the region 160 under the gate 120, would lead one skilled in the art to easily understand that the region 160 could only be a channel dopant region.

As the amendments to the specification and claims were only related to changing one convention to another, no new matter is being added. In view of this, in conjunction with the telephone conversation between the Examiner and the attorney of record on July 2, 2003, the Applicant requests the §132 objection be removed.

II. Rejection of Claims 1-3, 6-13 and 16-20 under 35 U.S.C. §112

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-3, 6-13 and 16-20 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. As disclosed above, the amendments to the claims and specification did not add new matter. Therefore, the amendments were proper, and appropriately corrected any issues that may have existed as to one skilled in the art being able to make and/or use the invention. Accordingly, the Applicant requests the §112, first paragraph, rejection be removed.

III. Rejection of Claims 1-3, 6-13 and 16-20 under 35 U.S.C. §112

The Examiner has also rejected Claims 1-3, 6-13 and 16-20 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. For the reasons set forth directly above, the Examiner's §112, second paragraph, rejection is deemed moot. Therefore, the Applicant requests the Examiner withdraw this rejection.


IV. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicant now sees all of the Claims currently pending in this application to be in condition for allowance and therefore earnestly solicits a Notice of Allowance for Claims 1-20.

The Applicant requests the Examiner to telephone the undersigned attorney of record at (972) 480-8800 if such would further or expedite the prosecution of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

HITT GAINES, P.C.



Greg H. Parker
Registration No. 44,995

Dated: 7-3-07

P.O. Box 832570
Richardson, Texas 75083
(972) 480-8800